

IN THE UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE
BEFORE THE BOARD OF PATENT APPEALS AND INTERFERENCES

REPLY BRIEF FOR THE APPELLANT

Ex parte BOSWORTH, *et al.*

CELL BASED DATA PROCESSING

Serial No. 09/741,219

Confirmation No. 7676

Appeal No.:

Group Art Unit: 2193

In the event that there may be any fees due with respect to the filing of this paper, please charge Deposit Account No. 50-2222.

/Keith M. Mullervy/

Keith M. Mullervy

Attorney for Appellant(s)

Reg. No. 62,382

SQUIRE, SANDERS & DEMPSEY LLP

8000 Towers Crescent Drive, 14th Floor

Vienna, VA 22182-6212

Atty. Docket: 104402.00119

KMM/jf

Encls: Reply Brief

IN THE UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE
BEFORE THE BOARD OF PATENT APPEALS AND INTERFERENCES

In re the Appellant:

Adam BOSWORTH *et al.*

Appeal No.:

Serial Number: 09/741,219

Group Art Unit: 2193

Filed: December 19, 2000

Examiner: Tuan A. Vu

Confirmation No. 7676

For: CELL BASED DATA PROCESSING

REPLY BRIEF

November 29, 2010

I. INTRODUCTION

This Reply Brief is filed in response to the Examiner's Answer dated November 12, 2010. In the Examiner's Answer, while no new grounds of rejection are made, comments and explanations are provided which are tantamount to new points of argument. This Reply Brief, therefore, is submitted to address these new points of argument, and to clarify why claims 1, 5-11, and 15-21 of the pending application should be considered to be patentable over W3C, "XML Path Language (XPath)" and "XSL Transformation (XSLT)", version 1.0; W3C Recommendation 16 November 1999 (collectively, "W3C"), and, therefore, should be found by this Honorable Board of Patent Appeals and Interferences to be allowable.

This Reply Brief addresses several deficiencies of the Examiner's Answer. Appellants' Appeal Brief, however, is maintained, and failure to repeat the arguments contained therein, or to address one or more argument set forth in the Examiner's Answer

should not be construed as waiver or an admission. The Appeal Brief speaks for itself, and this Reply Brief merely supplements the Appeal Brief to address certain aspects of the Examiner's Answer.

II. STATUS OF CLAIMS

Claims 1, 5-11, and 15-21, all of the claims pending in the present application, are the subject of this appeal. Claims 1, 5-11, and 15-21 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over W3C. Claims 2-4, 12-14, and 22-25 were previously cancelled by Appellants.

III. ARGUMENT

Appellants respectfully submit that each of the pending claims 1, 5-11, and 15-21 recites subject matter which is neither disclosed nor suggested by W3C.

A. Claims 1, 11, and 21

As discussed in Appellants' Appeal Brief, W3C fails to disclose or suggest, "a data processing specification comprising a plurality of cells, wherein each cell comprises a formula specifying an action or computation to perform when the cell is executed, and one or more attributes referencing other cells, wherein the formula of a first cell may reference a value of a second cell, wherein each cell is delineated by a beginning and ending tag, and one of the cells is reserved as an output cell for outputting a result of the processing ... wherein each cell is interlocked with at least one other cell through the formula or attribute of each cell," as recited in independent claim 1, and similarly recited in

independent claims 11 and 21.

In the Examiner's Answer, the Examiner took the position that the Final Office Action did not allege that the source tree of W3C discloses or suggests the aforementioned limitation of independent claim 1, and similar limitations of independent claims 11 and 21. See Examiner's Answer at page 11 ("Unlike the allegation by the Appellants, the XML source code is not cited to match the cells of "plurality of cells..."). Thus, it appears, that the Examiner's Answer concedes that the source tree of W3C fails to disclose or suggest the aforementioned limitation of independent claim 1, and similar limitations of independent claims 11 and 21. However, at a previous page, the Examiner's Answer appears to take a contradictory position. Specifically, the Examiner's Answer alleged that the term "data processing specification" can be interpreted as the following:

(i) any of [sic] specification which is result [sic] from deriving semantic relationship among nodes of such input XML document being parsed into a tree (which is integral to a [sic] interpreting of a [sic] extensible markup language hierarchy, using X-Path as in W3C), a specification defined from analyzing this input XML tree or

(ii) a stylesheet specification based on said initial tree specification which is represented by a cell in a XSLT template in the sense that this *template* – which is to be processed by a XSLT processor – is generated to implement the proper rendering ... of such source document based on the data dependencies as presented above.

See Examiner's Answer at page 10.

Thus, in (i), it appears the Examiner's Answer is again relying on the source tree of W3C to reject the claims, alleging that a specification is defined in W3C from analyzing a source tree. To the extent that the Examiner's Answer is alleging that the source tree of W3C discloses or suggests the aforementioned limitation of independent claim 1, and

similar limitations of independent claims 11 and 21, Appellants respectfully submit that this position is incorrect. W3C merely describes a source tree as an object that includes nodes, where each node includes data elements, where elements from the source tree can be filtered and reordered by a style sheet, and arbitrary structure can be added. See W3C – XSLT at Section 1. Introduction. The source tree merely includes nodes, where each node include data elements. The source tree does not include a formula specifying an action or computation to perform when the cell is executed, and does not include one or more attributes referencing other cells. The source tree further does not include a cell reserved as an output cell for outputting a result of processing. Finally, the source tree does not include a plurality of cells, where each cell is interlocked with at least one other cell through the formula or attribute of each cell.

Therefore, the source tree described in W3C does not disclose or suggest “a data processing specification comprising a plurality of cells, wherein each cell comprises a formula specifying an action or computation to perform when the cell is executed, and one or more attributes referencing other cells, wherein the formula of a first cell may reference a value of a second cell, wherein each cell is delineated by a beginning and ending tag, and one of the cells is reserved as an output cell for outputting a result of the processing ... wherein each cell is interlocked with at least one other cell through the formula or attribute of each cell,” as recited in independent claim 1, and similarly recited in independent claims 11 and 21.

With respect to (ii), W3C explicitly discloses that a template is an instantiation of a template rule, and a template is instantiated for a particular source element to create part of the tree. See W3C at Section 1. Introduction. Thus, a template is merely a tangible

representation of a template rule and includes the same elements and instructions as a template rule. As described in the Appeal Brief, a template rule, and thus a template, does not include a formula that references a value of a second cell.

Therefore, the source tree described in W3C does not disclose or suggest “a data processing specification comprising a plurality of cells, wherein each cell comprises a formula specifying an action or computation to perform when the cell is executed, and one or more attributes referencing other cells, wherein the formula of a first cell may reference a value of a second cell, wherein each cell is delineated by a beginning and ending tag, and one of the cells is reserved as an output cell for outputting a result of the processing ... wherein each cell is interlocked with at least one other cell through the formula or attribute of each cell,” as recited in independent claim 1, and similarly recited in independent claims 11 and 21.

The Examiner’s Answer further took the position that the Final Office Action did not allege that the result tree of W3C discloses or suggests the aforementioned limitation of independent claim 1, and similar limitations of independent claims 11 and 21. See Examiner’s Answer at page 12. Thus, the Examiner’s Answer concedes that the result tree of W3C fails to disclose or suggest the aforementioned limitation of independent claim 1, and similar limitations of independent claims 11 and 21.

The Examiner’s Answer further took the position that a template rule of W3C discloses the aforementioned limitation of independent claim 1, and similar limitations of independent claims 11 and 21. See Examiner’s Answer at pages 12-16. Appellants respectfully submit that this position is incorrect. As a procedural matter, the Examiner’s Answer appears to analyze Appellants’ specification, highlight certain keywords, allege

that the keywords are also found in W3C, and thus, conclude that the template rule of W3C discloses the aforementioned limitation of independent claim 1, and similar limitations of independent claims 11 and 21. See *e.g.*, Examiner's Answer at page 13 ("The formula or operation like <value-of-select=...> as disclosed is further described in X-cell formulas at page 9 of the instant Disclosure ... which is indication that X-cell or <Xsheet> is analogous to the xsl:stylesheet cited as <xsl:template .../> in W3C;" "[b]esides, the formulas disclosed by the invention such as *value-of*, *select* reflect the very operations disclosed by the W3C methodology as "value-of select = .../>;" "similarly, the <x:sheet> depicted at page 6 or 7 of the instant Specifications [sic] is reminiscent of the structured language of *stylesheet* terminology [of W3C]"). Such an analysis is not a proper obviousness analysis under the Manual of Patent Examining Procedure ("MPEP"). Instead, the claims of the application, rather than the specification, must be properly interpreted, as guided by MPEP § 2111, and a comparison must be made between the properly-interpreted claims (not the specification) and the prior art. Thus, the analysis used in the Examiner's Answer cannot be relied upon to support the obviousness rejections of the claims.

Turning to more substantive matters, the Examiner's Answer alleged that the template rules of W3C do reference a value of a second cell, citing two examples: sections 2.3 and 5.4 of W3C. See Examiner's Answer at page 13. Appellants respectfully submit that neither example discloses or suggests a formula of a first cell that references a value of a second cell. In Section 2.3, W3C discloses a match template entitled "Expense Report Summary," as follows:

```

<xsl:stylesheet version="1.0"
  xmlns:xsl="http://www.w3.org/1999/XSL/Transform"
  xmlns="http://www.w3.org/TR/xhtml1/strict:>
<xsl:template match="/">
<html>
<head>
<title>Expense Report Summary</title>
</head>
<body>
<p>Total Amount: <xsl:value-of select="expense-report/total"/></p>
</body>
</html>
</xsl:template>
</xsl:stylesheet>

```

See W3C at Section 2.3 Literal Result Element as Stylesheet. Contrary to the allegation of the Examiner's Answer, the `xsl:value-of select` element, located in the body of the template, does not reference a value in another cell. Instead, the `xsl:value-of select` element is used to compute generated text, by extracting text from the source tree or by inserting the value of a variable, using an expression that is specified as the value of the `select` attribute. See W3C – XSLT at Section 7.6.1. Generating Text with `xsl:value-of`. Contrary to the position of the Examiner's Answer, the `xsl:value of select` element does not reference any value in the head of the template rule. This is because the head of the template rule merely contains the title of the template rule, and the `xsl:value of select` element does not use the title of the template rule to extract text from the source tree or to insert the value of a variable.

Similarly, the `select` attribute described in Section 5.4 of W3C does not reference a value in another cell, as shown below:


```

<xsl:template match="author-group">
  <fo:inline-sequence>
    <xsl:apply-templates select="author/given-name"/>
  </fo:inline-sequence>
</xsl:template>

```

See W3C at Section 5.4 Applying Template Rules. As can be seen above, contrary to the position of the Examiner's Answer, the xsl:apply-templates select element does not reference a value in another cell because the xsl:apply-templates select element performs an operation on the author-group, which is neither a value nor in another cell.

In contrast, according to an embodiment of the invention, a formula of a first cell may reference a value of a second cell, as shown in the below embodiment described in the specification:

```

<x:xsheet>
  <x:xcell name="preferences"
    <mydata>
      <favoritecolor>red</favoritecolor>
      <favoritetoy>balloon</favoritetoy>
    </mydata>
  </x:xcell>
  <x:output>
    <x: value-of select="$preferences/mydata/favoritecolor"/>
    <x: value-of select="$preferences/mydata/favoritetoy"/>
  </x:output>
</x:xsheet>

```

See Specification at page 7, line 16 – page 8, line 4. As shown above, according to the embodiment, the formula in the "output" x-cell refers to the values favoritecolor and favoritetoy in the "preferences" x-cell. This type of referencing is not disclosed or suggested in W3C.

The Examiner's Answer further alleged that the element "formula ... references a value in a second cell" has been interpreted based on the operation explicitly explained in

the disclosure, and that the operation implicates a definition of one variable in an upper cell whose value is to be obtained from executing a formula defined in a second cell. See Examiner's Answer at pages 16-17. However, this allegation rests on the template rule examples of W3C previously described. As also previously described, neither of these examples disclose or suggest a formula of a first cell that references a value of a second cell, because neither formula references a value in another cell.

The Examiner's Answer further alleged that Appellant's arguments fail to comply with 37 CFR 1.111(b) because they amount to a general allegation that the claims define a patentable invention without specifically pointing out how the language of the claims patentably distinguishes them from the reference. See Examiner's Answer at pages 17-18, also at pages 19 and 21. Given that Appellants' Appeal Brief included over twelve pages of detailed analysis, including multiple citations to the W3C reference, showing why W3C fails to disclose or suggest the aforementioned elements of independent claim 1, and similar limitations of independent claims 11 and 21, this allegation is clearly erroneous.

The Examiner's Answer also alleged that the "xsl:output" feature of W3C discloses a stylesheet including a plurality of cells, where one of the cells is reserved as an output cell for outputting a result of the processing. The Examiner's Answer alleged that the "output result" as claimed is viewed as a result or output from evaluation of formula of cells being processed as execution flow, the claim does not relate "output" reserved cell to the formula in terms of it being a reserved container specifically created to collect the value obtained from the action based on the formula, and that the claim only described this cell as one cell that obtains a result of the processing. See Examiner's Answer at

pages 18-19. Appellants respectfully submit that this position is incorrect.. W3C describes a stylesheet element, `xsl:output`, that allows an XSLT processor to output a result tree formed by the stylesheet. See W3C – XSLT at Sec. 16. Output. W3C further describes an XML output method that outputs the result tree as a well-formed XML external general parsed entity, an HTML output method that outputs the result tree as HTML, and a text output method that outputs the result tree as text. See W3C – XSLT at Section 16.1. XML Output Method; Section 16.2. HTML Output Method; and Section 16.3. Text Output Method. Appellants respectfully submit that W3C describes that an XSLT processor may output the result tree using the `xsl:output` element of a stylesheet, but that it is not required to be able to do so. See W3C – XSLT at Sec. 16. Output. Thus, W3C fails to disclose or suggest that the `xsl:output` element of W3C is a cell reserved as an output cell for outputting a result of processing.

The Examiner's Answer further alleged that the "`xsl:value-of`" element discloses a stylesheet that includes a plurality of cells, where each cell is interlocked with at least one other cell through the formula or attribute of each cell. See Examiner's Answer at page 19. However, the Examiner's Answer relies on the rationale described above, rationale that has been successfully rebutted in this Reply Brief. Thus, Appellants respectfully submit that W3C fails to disclose or suggest that `xsl:value-of` element of W3C is a cell that is interlocked with at least one other cell through the formula or attribute of each cell.

Finally, the Examiner's Answer denied any "mixing and matching" in the Final Office Action, and alleged that in the Final Office Action, sections of W3C were specifically matched with each limitation of the claims, as the features of the claim have been interpreted, and the rejection has been explained in the Examiner's Answer. See

Examiner's Answer at page 20. While Appellants respectfully appreciate the clarification by the Examiner that the source tree and the result tree of W3C do not disclose or suggest the aforementioned limitations of independent claim 1, and similar limitations of independent claims 11 and 21, Appellants respectfully submit that the template rule, and thus, the template, of W3C also do not disclose or suggest the aforementioned limitations for the reasons discussed above.

Accordingly, Appellants respectfully submit that W3C fails to disclose or suggest, "a data processing specification comprising a plurality of cells, wherein each cell comprises a formula specifying an action or computation to perform when the cell is executed, and one or more attributes referencing other cells, wherein the formula of a first cell may reference a value of a second cell, wherein each cell is delineated by a beginning and ending tag, and one of the cells is reserved as an output cell for outputting a result of the processing ... wherein each cell is interlocked with at least one other cell through the formula or attribute of each cell," as recited in independent claim 1, and similarly recited in independent claims 11 and 21. Therefore, it is respectfully requested that this rejection be reversed and the claims allowed.

B. Claims 5 and 15

As discussed in Appellants' Appeal Brief, W3C fails to disclose or suggest, "wherein the first cell has a first attribute referencing a second attribute of said second cell," as recited in claim 5 and similarly recited in claim 15. The Examiner's Answer took the position that the `xsl:value-of` select element of W3C discloses the aforementioned limitation, referring back to its reasoning regarding independent claims 1, 11, and 21. See

Examiner's Answer at pages 20-21. Appellants respectfully submit that this position is incorrect. As previously described with respect to independent claims 1, 11, and 21, the examples of template rules described in sections 2.3 and 5.4 of W3C do not disclose or suggest a first cell that has a first attribute referencing a second attribute of a second cell, because the `xsl:value` of select element of either example does not reference any value in another cell. Specifically, in the example described in section 2.3 of W3C, the head of the template rule merely contains the title of the template rule, as opposed to an attribute, and the `xsl:value` of select element does not use reference any value in the title of the template rule to extract text from the source tree or to insert the value of a variable. See W3C at Section 2.3 Literal Result Element as Stylesheet. Furthermore, in the example described in section 5.4 of W3C, the `xsl:apply-templates` select element does not reference a value in another cell because the `xsl:apply-templates` select element performs an operation on the author-group, which is neither a value nor in another cell.

Thus, W3C fails to disclose or suggest “wherein the first cell has a first attribute referencing a second attribute of said second cell,” as recited in claim 5 and similarly recited in claim 15. In addition, claim 5 is patentable for the same reasons that claim 1 is patentable, and claim 15 is patentable for the same reasons that claim 11 is patentable. Accordingly, it is respectfully requested that this rejection be reversed and the claims allowed.

C. Claims 6 and 16

As discussed in Appellants' Appeal Brief, W3C fails to disclose or suggest, “wherein said second cell comprises a reserved mnemonic for providing input to the data

processing specified by the data processing specification,” as recited in claim 6 and similarly recited in claim 16. The Examiner’s Answer took the position that a template, as described in W3C, uses a short code for a location to store a value, this short code being a \$, @, or another operator which is viewed as an abbreviated construct to obviate verbose code form. See Examiner’s Answer at page 21. Appellants respectfully submit that this position is incorrect. W3C merely discloses that in an attribute value template, a value of a src attribute of an img element can be computed from a value of an image-dir variable and the string-value of a href child of a photograph element, and fails to disclose or suggest a reserved mnemonic for providing input. See W3C at Section 7.6.2. Attribute Value Templates. In fact, the cited portion of W3C makes no mention of the term “mnemonic.”

Thus, W3C fails to disclose or suggest “wherein said second cell comprises a reserved mnemonic for providing input to the data processing specified by the data processing specification,” as recited in claim 6 and similarly recited in claim 16. In addition, claim 6 is patentable for the same reasons that claim 1 is patentable, and claim 16 is patentable for the same reasons that claim 11 is patentable. Accordingly, it is respectfully requested that this rejection be reversed and the claims allowed.

D. Claims 7 and 17

As discussed in Appellants’ Appeal Brief, W3C fails to disclose or suggest, “wherein said first cell is a reserved output cell specification specifying output of the data processing specified by the data processing specification,” as recited in claim 7 and similarly recited in claim 17. The Examiner’s Answer took the position that an output cell

and embedded output method, as defined in sections 16.1 and 16.2 of W3C, “reasonably matches the reserved cell recited as first cell having a specification ... that internally references a value.” See Examiner’s Answer at page 22. Appellants respectfully submit that this position is incorrect, because W3C fails to disclose or suggest that a template rule, or template, is required to include an `xsl:output` element. More specifically, W3C describes a stylesheet element, `xsl:output`, that allows an XSLT processor to output a result tree formed by the stylesheet. See W3C – XSLT at Sec. 16. Output. W3C further describes an XML output method that outputs the result tree as a well-formed XML external general parsed entity, a HTML output method that outputs the result tree as HTML, and a text output method that outputs the result tree as text. See W3C – XSLT at Section 16.1. XML Output Method; Section 16.2. HTML Output Method; and Section 16.3. Text Output Method. W3C describes that an XSLT processor may output the result tree using the `xsl:output` element of a stylesheet, but that it is not required to be able to do so. See W3C – XSLT at Sec. 16. Output. Thus, W3C fails to disclose or suggest that the `xsl:output` element of W3C is a reserved output cell specification specifying output of the data processing specified by the data processing specification.

Thus, W3C fails to disclose or suggest “wherein said first cell is a reserved output cell specification specifying output of the data processing specified by the data processing specification,” as recited in claim 7 and similarly recited in claim 17. In addition, claim 7 is patentable for the same reasons that claim 1 is patentable, and claim 17 is patentable for the same reasons that claim 11 is patentable. Accordingly, it is respectfully requested that this rejection be reversed and the claims allowed.

E. Claims 8 and 18

Claim 8 is dependent upon claim 1, and claim 18 is dependent upon claim 11. Therefore, claim 8 is patentable for the same reasons that claim 1 is patentable, and claim 18 is patentable for the same reasons that claim 11 is patentable. Accordingly, it is respectfully requested that this rejection be reversed and the claim allowed.

F. Claims 9 and 19

As discussed in Appellants' Appeal Brief, W3C fails to disclose or suggest, "wherein said data processing specification further includes one or more global attributes specifying one or more global processing characteristics for the specified data processing," as recited in claim 9 and similarly recited in claim 19. The Examiner's Answer took the position that "the claimed 'one or more global processing characteristics' is not construed as containing a particular restrictive constraint that would significantly read away from the XSLT global attribute such as a version characteristic used to dictate a particular engine to process the language protocol. See Examiner's Answer at page 24. Appellants respectfully submit that this position is incorrect, as claim 9 recites that the one or more global processing characteristics are for the specified data processing, and claim 19 recites a similar limitation. W3C describes that "xsl:stylesheet version" is merely a version attribute that indicates the version of XSLT that the stylesheet requires. See W3C – XSLT at Section 2.2. Stylesheet Element. W3C fails to disclose or suggest that the version attribute is used by any of the stylesheet elements to process a source tree and convert it to a result tree. Furthermore, W3C describes that "xmlns:xsl" is merely a XSLT namespace attribute which is used to identify the namespace used by the

stylesheet and to recognize elements and attributes within the stylesheet. See W3C – XSLT at Section 2.1. XSLT Namespace. W3C fails to disclose or suggest that the stylesheet uses the namespace to process a source tree and convert it to a result tree. Thus, W3C fails to disclose or suggest that the xsl:stylesheet version and xmlns:xsl elements of W3C are global attributes specifying one or more global processing characteristics for a specified data processing.

Thus, W3C fails to disclose or suggest “wherein said data processing specification further includes one or more global attributes specifying one or more global processing characteristics for the specified data processing,” as recited in claim 9. and similarly recited in claim 19. In addition, claim 9 is patentable for the same reasons that claim 1 is patentable, and claim 19 is patentable for the same reasons that claim 11 is patentable. Accordingly, it is respectfully requested that this rejection be reversed and the claims allowed.

G. Claims 10 and 20

As discussed in Appellants’ Appeal Brief, W3C fails to disclose or suggest, “wherein said one or more global attributes include a global attribute specifying a format for providing the specified data processing with an HTTP request,” as recited in claim 10 and similarly recited in claim 20. The Examiner’s Answer alleged that “when one global [attribute] specifies a namespace having all the included metadata, support document/files and libraries relevant to using the [stylesheet], [the] globally defined attributed reads on specifying a format ... for providing “specified data processing” with [an] HTTP request.” See Examiner’s Answer at page 24. Appellants respectfully submit

that this position is incorrect. As previously described, W3C describes that “xmlns:xsl” is merely a XSLT namespace attribute which is used to identify the namespace used by the stylesheet and to recognize elements and attributes within the stylesheet. See W3C – XSLT at Section 2.1. XSLT Namespace. W3C fails to disclose or suggest that the stylesheet uses the namespace to specify a format for providing a specified data processing with an HTTP request. Thus, W3C fails to disclose or suggest that the xmlns:xsl element of W3C is a global attribute specifying a format for providing the specified data processing with an HTTP request.

Thus, W3C fails to disclose or suggest “wherein said one or more global attributes include a global attribute specifying a format for providing the specified data processing with an HTTP request,” as recited in claim 10 and similarly recited in claim 20. In addition, claim 10 is patentable for the same reasons that claim 1 is patentable, and claim 20 is patentable for the same reasons that claim 11 is patentable. Accordingly, it is respectfully requested that this rejection be reversed and the claims allowed.

IV. CONCLUSION

This final rejection being in error, therefore, it is respectfully requested that this honorable Board of Patent Appeals and Interferences reverse the Examiner's decision in this case and indicate the allowability of application claims 1, 5-11, and 15-21.

In the event that this paper is not being timely filed, the applicants respectfully petition for an appropriate extension of time. Any fees for such an extension together with any additional fees which may be due with respect to this paper may be charged to Counsel's Deposit Account 50-2222.

Respectfully submitted,

SQUIRE, SANDERS & DEMPSEY LLP

/Keith M. Mullervy/
Keith M. Mullervy
Attorney for Applicant(s)
Registration No. 62,382

Atty. Docket No.: 104402.00119

8000 Towers Crescent Drive, 14th Floor
Vienna, VA 22182-6212
Tel: (703) 720-7800
Fax (703) 720-7802

KMM:jf